

Message

From: Sinks, Thomas (Tom) [Sinks.Tom@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/23/2019 12:19:07 PM
To: Grifo, Francesca [Grifo.Francesca@epa.gov]; Cogliano, Vincent [cogliano.vincent@epa.gov]
CC: Sinks, Thomas (Tom) [Sinks.Tom@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Meeting Summary: Key IRB Questions to Address with [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]
Attachments: RE: IRB [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

I wanted to make you aware of an issue [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] we were asked to deal with. It was framed as a Human Subjects Research ethics issue. We did not feel this was a violation of Human Subjects Research Ethics. So it would not surprise me [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] reaches out to you. It appears to be a dissolution of a research collaboration that (at the present moment) is being expressed as an authorship dispute. It is possibly exacerbated by an earlier reorganization that placed parts of the original collaboration in two different divisions.

See the email string below. It may help to read the attached emails first since they were the starting points and then these in reverse order.

[Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] added this response to the email from [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] on 8/21 ...

"If the individual was working as a student contractor at the time under one of the collaborators (which we still need to verify), would they be considered part of the team?"

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Hope that helps [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

P.S., I see [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] has already addressed plagiarism and scientific misconduct, so I won't repeat that here.

From: Sinks, Thomas (Tom) <Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 10:01 AM

To: [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

[Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

Cc: Sinks, Thomas (Tom) <Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Meeting Summary: Key IRB Questions to Address with [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

A couple of thoughts ...

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Regardless of hurt feelings, I encourage you to address this in a neutral and constructive fashion. What lessons can be learned from this? How can we assure that collaborations are beneficial to everyone? It is OK to express your feelings but be careful about your blame.

From: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 9:02 AM

To: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Subject: RE: Meeting Summary: Key IRB Questions to Address w Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

I also would like to thank everyone again for meeting yesterday. Regarding Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) point #1 below, one item I had spoke with Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) about previously was the designation of the primary author as being from an outside organization. If the individual was working as a student contractor at the time under one of the collaborators (which we still need to verify), would they be considered part of the team? I'm sorry we didn't bring up point 3 yesterday for your interpretation, but would appreciate your thoughts. Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) Thanks.

From: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 6:18 AM

To: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Subject: Meeting Summary: Key IRB Questions to Address with Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Everyone,

Thank you for discussing my IRB concerns regarding a recent publication using Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) (without my knowledge).

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

As a follow up to our discussion yesterday, these are the key potential IRB issues that Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) needs to address regarding these data and publication:

1. The primary author was from an outside organization. Did Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) provide this investigator with the original participant identification numbers (i.e., PID 5) and how were these data transmitted to this outside organization?

2. D[Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] provide this dataset to this outside investigator with a combination of data that could be used to identify a participant? As this study was conducted [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] d i.e., this study involved

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

3. In this recently published article, the authors have “plagiarized” a table from my previous publication (Table 1) within their tab[Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] without proper attribution (not citing the source within this table). I have attached my previous article as a reference.

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)